ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. TI-36366 **PATENT**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	Srinath Hosur, *et al.*
Serial No.:	10/755,603
Filed:	January 12, 2004
Title:	TIME-SWITCHED PREAMBLE GENERATOR, METHOD OF GENERATING AND MULTIPLE-INPUT, MULTIPLE-OUTPUT COMMUNICATION SYSTEM EMPLOYING THE GENERATOR AND METHOD
Grp./A.U.:	2618
Examiner:	Dominic E. Rego Confirmation No.: 9552

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically filed with United States Patent and trademark Office on:
May 20, 2008 (Date)
Debbie Sams
(Printed or typed name of person signing the certificate)
/Debbie Sams/
(Signature of the person signing the certificate)

Sir:

APPELLANTS' REPLY BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. §41.41

In response to the Examiner's Answer electronically delivered March 21, 2008, the Appellants submit this Reply Brief as required by 37 C.F.R. §41.41.

I. Reply to Examiner's Arguments

In the Examiner's Answer of March 21, 2008, the Examiner asserts that an IEEE 802.11(a) long sequence **can** be an odd or even sequence where the odd or even sequence is not considered a complete training sequence. (*See* Examiner's Action of March 21, 2008, pages 11-12. **Emphasis added.**) Without addressing whether this is true, the original specification, as recognized by the Examiner, states in paragraph 24 and Figure 2 that:

> "In one embodiment of the present invention, a training sequence (*i.e.*, **an** IEEE 802.11(a) long sequence) is employed as the first preamble to the first transmit antenna T1, and a null is employed as the second preamble to the second transmit antenna T2, wherein the preambles occur during the initial time interval. Then, the first and second preambles are interchanged between the first and second transmit antennas T1, T2 for concurrent transmission during the subsequent time interval. (*See* paragraph 24 and Figure 2. **Emphasis added**.)

Thus, the original specification describes **an** IEEE 802.11(a) long sequence as a training sequence. The cited portion of the original specification does not describe a training sequence that is a portion of an IEEE 802.11(a) long sequence, at least a portion of an IEEE 802.11(a) long sequence, or a divided IEEE 802.11(a) long sequence. On the contrary, the training sequence is an IEEE 802.11(a) long sequence. Therefore, unlike the cited reference Suh, which uses a divided sequence, paragraph 24 and Figure 2 of the original specification describe a training sequence which is a complete and undivided training sequence, such as an IEEE 802.11(a) long sequence. Accordingly, present independent Claims 1, 9, and 16 comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph.

II. Conclusion

For the reasons set forth above, the original specification supports the pending independent claims and, thus, the independent claims comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Further, the Claims are patentably nonobvious over Suh and Suh in view of Li. Accordingly, the Appellants respectfully request that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences reverse the Examiner's Final Rejection of all of the Appellants' pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, P.C.

Steven J. Hanke
Registration No. 58,076

Dated: May 20, 2008

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800